## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 13 have been objected to as containing informalities; Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being vague and indefinite; Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by <u>Tsunekawa et al.</u>; Claims 1, 3, 5 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over <u>Tsunekawa et al.</u> in view of <u>Nojiri et al.</u>; Claims 6 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over <u>Tsunekawa et al.</u> in view of <u>Nojiri et al.</u> and <u>Barboza</u>; Claims 7 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over <u>Tsunekawa et al.</u> in view of <u>Nojiri et al.</u> and <u>Barboza</u> and <u>Helfand</u>; Claims 9-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over <u>Tsunekawa et al.</u> in view of <u>Nojiri et al.</u> and <u>Barboza</u> and <u>Nakai</u>; and Claims 14 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over <u>Tsunekawa et al.</u> in view of <u>Nojiri et al.</u> and Applicants' admitted prior art. Claims 1, 3 and 5-16 remain active.

Considering first then the Examiner's objection to Claims 5 and 13, it is to be noted that appropriate amendments have now been made to each of these claims in compliance with U.S. patent practice.

Considering next then the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, it should be noted that Claim 11 has now been amended to delete the phrase "hand drum-like".

As further rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Tsunekawa et al., the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Tsunekawa et al. in view of Nojiri et al.; the rejection of Claims 6 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Tsunekawa et al. in view of Nojiri et al. and

Barboza; the rejection of Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Tsunekawa et al. in view of Nojiri et al. and Barboza and Helfand and the rejection of Claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Tsunekawa et al. in view of Nojiri et al. and Applicants' admitted prior art, it is to be noted that one of the characteristic features of each of independent Claims 1 and 13 as now amended is that the first guide guides the tape-like fiber bundle in a twisted state, the fiber bundle being advanced in a state such that a running direction thereof is at a right angle to a bobbin axis thereof and a tape face thereof is parallel to the bobbin axis. To the contrary, in the winding device of a continuous fiber bundle as shown in Tsunekawa et al., after the tape-like fiber bundle running with the tape in face thereof being at a right angle to the bobbin axis are twisted on two or more conical guides, the fiber bundle is wound on the bobbin with guiding of the tape face in parallel with the bobbin axis by the flat guide. In addition, it is to be noted then that the guide apparatus of the fiber bundle of Nojiri et al., the tape-like carbon fiber bundle running with the tape face thereof being at a right angle to the bobbin axis are wound on the bobbin while the tape face is gradually twisted and guided in parallel with the bobbin axis by plural guide rollers whose axis lines are changed by slow degrees or by a plate-like guide member having a twisted shape. As can thus be appreciated, neither Tsunekawa et al. nor Nojiri et al. teach or disclose the above-emphasized claim language added to Claims 1 and 13. It is further submitted that none of the remaining references of record teach or disclose the limitations now added to Claims 1 and 13. In view of this and in view of the dependency of all claims from either independent Claims 1 or 13, it is submitted that all pending claims in the present

Application No. 10/796,064 Reply to Office Action of January 4, 2006.

application merit favorable reconsideration and the same is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number 22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 06/04) JDH/rac

I:\ATTY\JDH\248424US-AF.DOC

Gregory J. Maie Attorney of Record Registration No. 25,599

James D. Hamilton Registration No. 28,421